

6-2-1976

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/02/1976

Esther Peterson

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/02/1976" (1976). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 794.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/794>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 2 June 1976
Presiding Officer: David Lygre, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Craig Allen, Rosella Dickson, Richard Doi, Owen Dugmore, Roger Garrett, Art Keith, Paul Kuroiwa, Robert Miller, Dale Samuelson, Milo Smith, Curt Wiberg and Madge Young.

Visitors Present: Charles McGehee, Don Cummings, Helmi Habib, Marci Baker, David Anderson and Dale Comstock.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested the following changes:

1. Under "Communications" add

C. Letter from Martin Kaatz

2. Under "Reports" add

C. Standing Committee Reports, change Item 1 to Budget Committee and Item 5 to Code Committee.

3. Under "New Business" delete

B. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Organizational Structure

Mr. Lygre announced that Tom Kerr, Committee Chairman, said the report will not be ready for several days.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 19, 1976 were approved with the following correction: on page 1 under Approval of the Minutes, the date May 5 1976 should be inserted. The minutes of the Special Senate Meeting of May 19, 1976 were approved as distributed.

COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Letter from Richard Hasbrouck, et al, dated May 3, 1976, requesting that George Town be considered a special case for promotion. Referred to Personnel Committee.
- B. Letter from Edward Harrington, dated May 25, 1976, regarding Organizational Development course offerings. This will be discussed under Curriculum Committee report.
- C. Letter from Edward Harrington, dated May 20, 1976, requesting the Faculty Senate appoint a Search Committee for a Dean of the School of Arts and Humanities, due to the imminent departure of Dr. John B. Housley. This will be discussed under Executive Committee report.
- D. Letter from Martin Kaatz, dated May 25, 1976, regarding the resignation of Otto Jakubek as Senate representative. Joel Andress will replace Mr. Jakubek; the alternate is Calvin Willberg.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

- A. Undergraduate Proposals, page 438.

MOTION NO. 1496: Mr. Hawkins moved, seconded by Mr. Jensen, that the curriculum proposals on page 348 be divided, so that Law and Justice 348 can be considered separately. Passed by unanimous voice vote with abstentions.

Mr. Lygre advised that Econ. 462, M ME 499, and Soc 310, will be considered first.

MOTION NO. 1497: Mr. Hawkins moved, seconded by Mr. Jensen, that the Senate approve the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals on page 438 with the exception of LAJ 348. Passed by unanimous voice vote.

Discussion began on the course LAJ 348 on page 438.

Mr. Hawkins mentioned there are three departments on campus offering courses in Family; Sociology, Psychology, and Home Economics and Family Studies.

Mr. McQuarrie questioned whether this course would cut into other courses or if it is a specialized course.

Mr. Jakubek advised that Item 7(e), page 3 of the Senate Curriculum Committee's report is pertinent.

Mr. Lygre said the Senate would now consider the merits of approving the course, LAJ 348.

MOTION NO. 1498: Mr. Hawkins moved, seconded by Mr. Jensen to approve the Undergraduate Course Proposal LAJ 348, on page 438.

There was considerable discussion on the motion.

Mr. Vifian commented he feels that in situations of this kind, he is not sure that individual departments are aware of particular program needs.

MOTION NO. 1499. Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Mr. Hawkins, to send the course to the Senate Curriculum Committee for recommendation. Failed by a show of hands: 10 yes, 11 no, and 5 abstentions.

Discussion resumed on approval of the LAJ 348 course.

Motion No. 1498 passed by voice vote with abstentions.

B. Graduate Proposals, page 77 (re-submitted)

Mr. Lygre explained that this had come before the Senate at the April 7 meeting. At that meeting a motion was passed to return these items to the Organizational Behavior Program until such time as the differences between the Psychology Department and Organizational Development can be resolved. A communication was received from Mr. Harrington relating to efforts that have been carried out to resolve the problem and these courses on page 77 are once again before the Senate.

MOTION NO. 1500: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Hawkins, to delete the course OB 558 on page 77 from consideration.

Mr. McQuarrie explained the deletion had been agreed to by Psychology and Organizational Development permitting this to be developed as a Psychology course.

Motion No. 1500 passed by unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1501: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Ms. Osborn, for approval of the remaining graduate curriculum proposals on page 77.

There was considerable discussion on these items.

MOTION NO. 1502: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Ms. Klug, for the question to close debate. Passed with a majority voice vote.

Motion No. 1501 passed with a show of hands: 13 yes, 11 no, 2 abstentions.

REPORTS

- A. Chairperson--Mr. Lygre reported he had just written a letter to President Brooks and the Board of Trustees regarding Code amendments that have been passed by the Senate. He also notified them of the collective bargaining election ballot in progress.

The faculty referendum was conducted a week ago concerning the Senate position on a motion to hold the elections in the fall. A yes vote had the effect of producing the election in the spring, and a no vote had the effect of having the election this fall. The votes were 167 yes, 113 no, 1 blank vote and a number of invalid ballots. Ballots were sent out as described in the Executive Committee's Contingency Plan.

Mr. Lygre announced there is a need to elect an at-large senator at this time to replace Dick Alumbaugh who has resigned. This at-large ballot will be conducted at the same time as the collective bargaining ballot, in order to save time, and both ballots are to be returned to the Senate office in the same Official Ballot envelope.

- B. Executive Committee--Mr. Bennett reported a letter had been received from Mr. Harrington regarding a Search Committee being appointed to look for a replacement for Dr. John Housley, Dean of the School of Arts and Humanities. The Executive Committee, in establishing a Search Committee along the guidelines laid out by Dr. Harrington, invited each of the Departments from that School to nominate two candidates. The Executive Committee selected from those nominees the following people to comprise the Search Committee: Alma Spithill, chairperson, Jay Bachrach, James Bilyeu, Donald Cummings, Clifford Cunha, William Dunning and James Hawkins.

MOTION NO. 1503: Mr. Bennett moved to accept the report of the off-campus Liberal Studies Program from Don Cummings.

MOTION NO. 1504: Mr. Bennett moved, seconded by Ms. Heckart, to amend the motion by adding the following sentence: In accepting this report, the Senate recognizes that no new students will be admitted to the Liberal Studies Program and that any proposal to extend the program will be subject to review by the Senate. Passed by unanimous voice vote.

Motion No. 1503, as amended, passed by a unanimous voice vote.

C. Standing Committees

1. Budget Committee--Jimmie Applegate yielded to Vice President Harrington, who reviewed the budget problems faced by CWSC. Mr. Harrington mentioned that the budget picture changes from day to day and he reviewed salary considerations and funding problems.

Mr. Applegate reported that the Senate Budget Committee had hoped the Board of Trustees would approve the Budget Committee's recommendation for distributing the 5% salary monies. The Committee proposed what they believed to be the wishes of the faculty; that is that such a small sum of money be distributed to all faculty without consideration of merit, and that salary inequities, since they are of long standing, be funded from sources outside the 5% monies.

MOTION NO. 1505: The Senate Budget Committee moved:

The Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that the five percent salary increase be distributed as recommended in Senate Motion No. 1463; i.e., by placing all faculty members on the proposed salary schedule plus one full step.

Furthermore, it is understood that future college budget requests will include monies sufficient to fund yearly increments; and

Furthermore, it is understood that the faculty, administration and the Board of Trustees will actively support and pursue with the legislature on a continuing basis the necessary funding levels; and

Furthermore, it is understood that should the above be met and should the legislature not appropriate the necessary funds, full compliance with Senate Motion No. 1463 is not binding on either the Administration or the Board of Trustees.

There was considerable discussion on the motion.

Ms. Heckart mentioned that one part of the motion concerned her; this is the last paragraph in the motion. If the funds cannot be found and then Senate Motion No. 1463 is not binding on either the Administration or the Board of Trustees, does the Senate Budget Committee have an "ace in the hole" compromise solution.

Mr. Applegate replied they did not.

Ms. Heckart said, then the implication of this motion would be that if Senate Motion No. 1463 were not binding on either the Administration or the Board of Trustees, the Senate would immediately revert to Item No. 5 which the Committee discarded.

Mr. Applegate said his understanding is that should money not be coming from this proposal, that Mr. Harrington will bring it to the Senate Executive Committee to resolve how that money is going to be distributed.

MOTION NO. 1506: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Ms. Heckart, to amend this report to include that list Mr. Applegate mentioned as a priority guideline.

Mr. McQuarrie explained his intention of the amendment is not to give the Board of Trustees options, but to give the Executive Committee guidance on what the will of the Senate is in terms of what they should pursue, in what rank order they ought to pursue options.

Mr. Jakubek, as a point of order, suggested Mr. McQuarrie's amendment is out of order and should be a separate motion.

Mr. McQuarrie and his second agreed and withdrew the motion.

Motion No. 1505 voted on and passed with a majority voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1507: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Vifian, that if the Board of Trustees rejects the recommendation in Motion 1505 that the Executive Committee pursue salary adjustments in the following order:

- (1) Fixed percentage
- (2) Fixed dollar
- (3) One step increments

Passed by majority voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Jakubek presented a report on charges given his committee during the year.

MOTION NO. 1508: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Ms. Klug, to adopt the report of the Senate Curriculum Committee.

MOTION NO. 1509: Mr. Vifian moved, seconded by Ms. Hileman, that action be postponed until the first meeting of fall quarter.

The merits of postponement were discussed.

Motion No. 1509 passed by majority voice vote with several abstentions.

3. Student Affairs Committee--No report.
4. Personnel Committee--Mr. Vifian distributed copies of the Committee's report to Senators present.

MOTION NO. 1510: The Personnel Committee moved that the following procedures become policy for the determination of eligibility for exception from the code requirements for promotion:

The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, in following the Code provision that it consider exceptions to code requirements for promotion, asks for the following supporting documents.

- A. A letter from the appropriate department chairman or program director recommending the promotion and supporting it.
- B. A supporting letter from the Dean.
- C. Sufficient data so the Committee can see the reasons for the decision.
- D. A copy of the department personnel committee's report (if any).

E. A tally of the individual department recommendations.

The committee will determine its recommendation of eligibility to the Senate primarily on the adequacy of the procedure used by the schools and departments and not on the merits of the information supplied.

Mr. Vifian accepted a friendly amendment from Mr. Applegate to insert in Item D, after the word department ", school and other." He also mentioned he would amend Item E and insert after the word department "member" and insert after recommendations ", if any." He also accepted a friendly amendment to insert in Item B at the end of the sentence "or appropriate administrator." Another friendly amendment accepted was to change Item A by striking the words "the promotion and", and insert the words "eligibility for promotion and" supporting it.

MOTION NO. 1511: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Hawkins, to close debate. Passed by unanimous voice vote.

Motion No. 1510 passed by majority voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1512: The Personnel Committee moved that the following people be considered for promotion.

Robert Panerio	Music
John DeMerchant	- Music
O. W. Wensley	- Speech Pathology
D. R. Eberhart	- Geography
George Town	- Computer Sciences
Curt Wiberg	- Biology

All of the above have been strongly recommended by their departments and department chairmen. They were supported by their school Deans. The decisions seem to have been very carefully arrived at and were based on impressive evidence.

MOTION NO. 1513: Mr. Hawkins moved the list should be separated and the people voted on by secret ballot. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion No. 1512 passed by voice vote with several abstentions.

The Personnel Committee recommended that John Foster, Communications, not be considered eligible for promotion. This decision has nothing to do with Mr. Foster's qualifications. He is currently teaching about one quarter time and has administrative duties for the rest of his work load. He, the committee concluded, should be treated as an administrator and be rewarded by his services under procedures applicable to that group.

5. Code Committee Report--No report.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

RECOMMENDED SALARY SCALE					
Normal Salary Range	Step	Index Points	Academic Salary	Full step Change Increase	
			DS=(IP) . (PV)	\$ increase	% increase
	-5	76.4	\$ 9,932		
	-4½	78.7	10,231		
	-4	81.0	10,530	598	6.02
	-3½	83.3	10,829	598	5.84
	-3	85.6	11,128	598	5.68
	-2½	88.0	11,440	611	5.64
	-2	90.4	11,752	624	5.60
	-1½	92.8	12,064	624	5.45
	-1	95.2	12,376	624	5.31
	-½	97.6	12,688	624	5.17
	0	100.0	13,000	624	5.04
	½	102.4	13,312	624	4.92
	1	104.8	13,624	624	4.80
	1½	107.3	13,949	637	4.79
	2	109.8	14,274	650	4.77
	2½	112.3	14,599	650	4.65
	3	114.8	14,924	650	4.55
	3½	117.3	15,249	650	4.45
	4	119.9	15,587	663	4.44
	4½	122.5	15,925	676	4.43
	5	125.1	16,263	676	4.34
	5½	127.7	16,601	676	4.24
	6	130.3	16,939	676	4.16
	6½	132.9	17,277	676	4.07
	7	135.6	17,628	689	4.07
	7½	138.3	17,979	702	4.06
	8	141.0	18,330	702	3.98
	8½	143.7	18,681	702	3.90
	9	146.5	19,045	715	3.90
	9½	149.3	19,409	728	3.90
	10	152.1	19,773	728	3.82
	10½	154.9	20,137	728	3.75
	11	157.8	20,514	741	3.74
	11½	160.7	20,891	754	3.74
	12	163.6	21,268	754	3.68
	12½	166.5	21,645	754	3.61
	13	169.5	22,035	767	3.61
	13½	172.5	22,425	780	3.60
	14	175.5	22,815	780	3.54
	14½	178.5	23,205	780	3.48
	15	181.6	23,608	793	3.48
	15½	184.7	24,011	806	3.47
	16	187.8	24,414	806	3.41
	16½	191.0	24,830	819	3.41
	17	194.2	25,246	832	3.41
	17½	197.4	25,662	832	3.35
	18	200.7	26,091	845	3.35
	18½	204.0	26,520	858	3.34
	19	207.3	26,949	858	3.29
	19½	210.7	27,391	871	3.28
	20	214.1	27,833	884	3.28
	20½	217.5	28,275	884	3.23
	21	221.0	28,730	897	3.22
	21½	224.5	29,185	910	3.22
	22	228.0	29,640	910	3.17
	22½	231.6	30,108	923	3.16
	23	235.2	30,576	936	3.16
	23½	238.8	31,044	936	3.11
	24	242.5	31,525	949	3.10
	24½	246.2	32,006	962	3.10
	25	250.0	32,500	975	3.09

1975-76

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

June 2

ROLL CALL

SENATOR

ALTERNATE

✓ Allen, Craig
✓ Alumbaugh, Dick
Applegate, Jimmie

Phil Tolin
Neil Roberts

✓ Bachrach, Jay
✓ Bennett, Robert
✓ Brooks, James
✓ Burt, David

Peter Burkholder
Robert Bentley
✓ Edward Harrington
Richard Johnson

✓ Dickson, Rosella
✓ Douce', Pearl
Doi, Richard
✓ Dudley, Stan
Dugmore, Owen

Margaret Lawrence
Joan Howe
Constance Speth
Gerald Brunner
Robert Nuzum

✓ Franz, Wolfgang

Charles Brunner

✓ Garrett, Roger
✓ Gregor, John
✓ Gulezian, Allen

Lynn Osborn
Bill Hillar
Jay Forsyth

✓ Hawkins, Charles
✓ Heckart, Beverly
✓ Hileman, Betty

David Kaufman
Gordon Warren
Deloris Johns

✓ Jakubek, Otto
✓ Jensen, J. Richard
Keith, Art
✓ Kingman, Kathy
✓ Klug, Linda
Kuroiwa, Paul

Joel Andress
Bonalyn Bricker
George Grossman

✓ Lester, Nancy
✓ Lygre, David

Dieter Romboy
Helmi Habib

✓ McQuarrie, Duncan
✓ Miller, Robert
✓ Dolores Osborn
✓ Purcell, John
Samuelson, Dale
Smith, Milo

Owen Pratz
Wallace Webster
Blaine Wilson
Kent Martin
Lee Fisher
A. James Hawkins

✓ Vifian, John
✓ Vogel, Ruth
Wiberg, Curt
✓ Winters, Roger

Keith Rinehart
Thomas Thelen
Robert Yee

✓ Yeh, Thomas
Young, Madge

William Craig
Joe Schomer

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Charles Withler

William J. ...

Heidi S. Halik

Marcia Baker

Dave Anderson

Dale Comstock

A G E N D A

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3:10 p.m., Wednesday June 2, 1976
Room 471, Psychology Building

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. CHANGES TO AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF May 19, 1976
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
 - A. Letter from Richard Hasbrouck et al
 - B. Letters from Ed Harrington
- V. CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
 - A. Undergraduate Proposals, page 438
 - B. Graduate Proposals, page 77 (resubmitted)
- VI. REPORTS
 - A. Chairperson
 - B. Executive Committee
 - C. Standing Committees
 - 1. Code
 - 2. Curriculum
 - 3. Student Affairs
 - 4. Personnel
 - 5. Budget
- VII. OLD BUSINESS
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Competency-Based Requirements
 - B. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Organizational Structure
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON
98926

May 25, 1976

RECEIVED
MAY 26 1976
FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David G. Lygre, Chairman
The Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

Since your letter to Dr. Pettit of April 9, 1976, indicating that page 77 of graduate curriculum changes were being returned to resolve differences between the Psychology Department and Organizational Development, several meetings and other events have occurred that warrant approval by the Faculty Senate of all of the changes of page 77 except OB 558. OB 558, Helping Relationship Skills, is to be developed as a Psychology course and should be deleted from consideration at this time.

On April 26, 1976, I convened a meeting of Professors Gulezian, Benson, Rich, Pettit, Kosy, Potter, Schliesman, Fitzgerald (Chairman of the Graduate Curriculum Committee), Street (Chairman of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee), Williams, Erickson, Ball, Dillard, and Comstock. As an outcome of that meeting, an Ad Hoc Committee of representatives of interested departments was established under the chairmanship of Dean Comstock to continue discussion and provide some recommendations to me.

They met again on May 5 and May 12 and produced the following recommendations:

1. The OB prefix would be endorsed for a limited number of courses with restrictions.
2. OB 558, Helping Relationship Skills, should be a Psychology course possibly cross listed with Education.
3. An advisory or development committee would be established for ODC including the chairmen of Psychology, Education, Sociology, Business Administration, and Business Education and Administrative Management.
4. OB 560, 562, 596, 598 were endorsed with the provisions that:
 - a. offerings under the 598 designation would also require the advisory committee approval as well as regular approval through channels.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

May 20, 1976

92929

RECEIVED

MAY 21 1976

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David G. Lygre
Chairman, Faculty Senate
CWSC, Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

With the imminent departure of Dr. John B. Housley, Dean of the School of Arts and Humanities, it is necessary to develop some contingency plans. After consulting with the chairmen of the School of Arts and Humanities, who, in turn, consulted with their faculty, I propose the following plan.

First, I suggest the Faculty Senate move ahead to appoint a search committee to look for Dr. Housley's successor. I further suggest that we follow the precedent we have already established, namely, one representative on the committee from each department in the school with an "outside" chairman, appointed by the Senate, from some department in another school.

Finally, pending the receipt of the report from the ad hoc Committee on Academic Organization, I suggest the committee organize itself, familiarize itself with the Affirmative Action policies and plan, develop a job description and, in general, be prepared to move ahead if the ad hoc committee's recommendations are such that no re-organization takes place. Such a move to advertise the position could conceivably take place this summer.

In the meantime, I am searching for an interim dean to work with Dean Housley before he leaves. The length of the interim dean's term will depend on the ad hoc committee's recommendation and Board of Trustees' approval.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,



Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Jm

MAY 10, 1976

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS APPROVED BY
THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
AND FORWARDED TO THE SENATE

PAGE 438

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

ECONOMICS

COURSE ADDITION

Econ. 462. Environmental Economics. 5 credits. Prerequisites, Econ. 100 or Econ. 201. A study of economic decision-making, related to issues of pollution, energy, resource use, and external effects. Analysis of benefit/cost, cost effectiveness, and other economic methods.

LAW AND JUSTICE

COURSE ADDITION

LAJ. 348. Family Law. 4 credits. Marriage, divorce, state regulation, custody, and care and supervision of children.

COMMUNICATION (MASS MEDIA) - COURSE ADDITION

M ME 499. Professional Seminar. 3 credits. Prerequisite, senior standing.

SOCIOLOGY

COURSE ADDITION

Soc. 310. Social Casework. 5 credits. Casework intervention, interviewing techniques and skills, traditional and contemporary methods, emphasis upon developing a personal casework style.

Report to the Faculty Senate
by the
Senate Curriculum Committee
June 2, 1976

Committee responses to the Charges given to the Committee during the 1976-76 year are as follows:

1. Review Guide to Curriculum Changes regarding:

a) credit allocation to courses. Is a statement needed to cover summer sessions which have 60-minute class periods?
Committee opinion: no.

b) guidelines defining course levels. Shall a statement be included in the Guide?
Committee opinion: yes (see 7d2).

c) implications of the statement (on page two of the Guide) observing that "Furthermore, administrative action, subject to Board approval, regarding the internal structure of the college affects curriculum."
Does this mean that all actions to reorganize -- [the college and its parts] --- should first be --- [reviewed] -- by the Senate Curriculum Committee and/or other faculty curriculum committees?
Committee opinion: no.

d) approval procedure for extended degree programs. This can presently by-pass the Senate.
Committee opinion: no, it can't (see Guide, p. 3; no exceptions are made from normal procedure).

e) procedures used in approving special topics (_98) courses. Are they adequate, in view of:

- 1) uneven distribution in their departments of lists issued periodically by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies;
- 2) possibility of course duplications and of repeated offerings of the same course (with only slight changes);
- 3) some need for Committee review.

Committee opinions:

- 1) this is a departmental-level problem, and should be solved or otherwise handled at that level;
- 2) the purpose of the campus-wide distribution of the Dean's list of special topics course proposals is to obviate these problems;
- 3) See (2), supra;

In sum, no substantive change in the present procedure is recommended. (see 7c below).

2. Examine the reorganization of the Department of Communications and the Mass Media Program into the Department of Communications and Mass Media and report to Senate on October 15.

Committee opinion: that the Senate should approve the already accomplished change. It did.

3. Examine curricular implications of the draft of CPE's Planning and Policy Recommendations and recommend appropriate action to the Senate. (CPE staff held a hearing on campus on October 21, 1975).

Committee action: none. Time did not permit it.

4. Consider drafting a policy on interdepartmental programs (a carryover from the previous year).

Committee action: none.

5. Consider drafting a policy on innovative programs (a carryover from the previous year).

Committee action: none.

6. Examine the undergraduate catalog for "hidden prerequisites" and higher-than-normal (or permitted by Guide) requirements for major and minor programs.

Committee action: after looking at all of the programs listed in the catalog, we concluded that very few were not in accordance with established criteria. Those deviating from the Guide fell into one or more of these categories:

- a) long-standing (i.e., 20 years) programs having detailed skill and participation requirements (e.g., Music Department);
- b) broad programs having coverage of several related fields, often with additional teacher certification requirements (e.g., Sciences);
- c) evolving programs reflecting considerable change in staff and outlook (e.g., Foreign Language);

7. Review curriculum policy recommendations from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee contained in a memorandum to the Senate from Warren Street of April 26, 1976:

- a) Variable credit courses.

U.C.C. recommendation: 1) variable credits should be restricted to those types of courses already so designated in the section "Credit Allocation to Courses" on page eight of the Guide: Workshop, seminar, individual study, special topics, practicum and field work. 2) courses with other titles and specific content must be offered and listed in the catalog for a fixed number of credits. 3) courses given in off-campus locations only which are modifications (lowered credit hours) of on-campus courses must be listed separately under different titles and numbers in the catalog. It is recommended that the words "offered off-campus only" accompany these course descriptions.

Committee action: agree.

b) Level of Individual Study Courses

U.C.C. recommendation: that all 296 listings be stricken from the catalog, effective with the 1979-80 catalog.

Committee action: agree. The following amendments to the Guide are suggested:

p. 7 Numbering of Courses.

4. Numbering system

Ending in 96 (offered only at 396, 496 and 596 levels). (effective beginning 1979-80 catalog).

p. 10 Individual Study Courses. Strike 296 from list.

c) Special Topics (see also (1)(c), page 1);

U.C.C. recommendations:

- 1) Each special topics title be offered once only. The course must be approved for catalog addition before additional offerings are made;
- 2) the criteria that apply to any proposed catalog course also apply to additions with a special topics number;
- 3) small committee made up of members of the U.C.C. and the Teacher Education [curriculum] Committee.

Committee action:

- 1) Each Special Topics course shall be limited to being offered no more than two times within a two year period following its being approved. After the second offering the course shall be dropped from the list of approved special topics courses. It shall be proposed as a regular course for any further offerings;
- 2) agree
- 3) Presently used procedures allow wider review than would that suggested by U.C.C. We believe that some of the problems (jurisdictional conflicts, e.g.) could be reduced by more careful screening of the proposals by the School Deans within the present review procedure.

d) Appropriateness and numbering of courses (see 1b, on page 1);

- 1) Appropriateness of course content. The U.C.C. report decries the preparation of proposals for courses that do not appear to be appropriate to the college level, and asks some rhetorical questions in regard to such preparation:

Committee action: commendation of the U.C.C. membership for maintaining standards of college work, and encouragement to them to continue to do so. This institution is a senior college, not a high school or community college, and must remain true to its mission.

2) Numbering of courses

U.C.C. recommendation: adopt the University of Washington standards for course numbering; review current catalog offerings accordingly.

Committee action: agree, with the minor changes indicated (see addendum 1).

e) Unstated effects of course proposals

U.C.C. recommendation: that the franchise for course generation and course prefixes be extended to academic departments only. Proposals for courses may come from many sources, but the sponsorship and prefix of an academic department shall be required for approval. The curricula of interdepartmental programs should be assigned to the departments that cooperate in them.

Committee action: agree.

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE MOTION

June 2, 1976

The Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that the five percent salary increase be distributed as recommended in Senate Motion No. 1463; i.e., by placing all faculty members on the proposed salary schedule plus one full step.

Futhermore, it is understood that future college budget requests will include monies sufficient to fund yearly increments, and

Furthermore, it is understood that the faculty, administration and the Board of Trustees will actively support and pursue with the legislature on a continuing basis the necessary funding levels, and

Futhermore, it is understood that should the above be met and should the legislature not appropriate the necessary funds, full compliance with Senate Motion No. 1463 is not binding on either the administration or the Board of Trustees.

Personnel Committee Report
Date: June 3, 1976

- I. The Personnel Committee moves that the following procedures become policy for the determination of eligibility for exception from the code requirements for promotion.

The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee in following the code provision that it consider exceptions to code requirements for promotion asks for the following supporting documents.

- A. A letter from the appropriate department chairman *on eligibility for promotion* or program director recommending ~~the promotion~~ and supporting it. *and*
- B. A supporting letter from the Dean *or appropriate administrator*.
- C. Sufficient data that the committee can see the reasons for the decision.
- D. A copy of the department *school + other* personnel committee's report (if any).
- E. A tally of the individual department *member* recommendations, *if any*.

The committee will determine its recommendation of eligibility to the Senate primarily on the adequacy of the procedure used by the schools and departments and not on the merits of the information supplied.

- II. The Personnel Committee moves that the following people be considered eligible for promotion.

Robert Panerio	- Music
John DeMerchant	- Music
O.W. Wensley	- Speech Pathology
D.R. Eberhart	- Geography
George Town	- Computer Sciences
Curt Wiberg	- Biology

All of the above have been strongly recommended by their departments and department chairmen. They were supported by their school Deans. The decisions seem to have been very carefully arrived at and were based on impressive evidence which satisfied those who understand their respective disciplines.

- III. The Personnel Committee recommends that John Foster, Communication, not be considered eligible for promotion.

This decision has nothing to do with his qualifications. He is currently teaching about one quarter time and has administrative duties for the rest of his work load. He, the committee concluded, should be treated as an administrator and be rewarded for his services under procedures applicable to that group.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Competency-Based Requirements
Ronald M. Frye, Chairman
Don Cummings
Barney Erickson
Jim Goodrich
Leslie Mueller
Donald Schliesman
Dan Unruh

RE: Committee Report

DATE: April 30, 1976

According to the charge given to this committee on January 5, 1976, the committee was to:

1. Investigate the desirability and feasibility of adopting competency-based requirements in English composition and if the committee considers it appropriate in other areas as well,
2. To determine whether and how reasonable and valid standards of evaluation could be implemented,
3. Whether and how students could receive adequate coursework and other assistance to meet any requirements which are adopted, and
4. What impact the adoption of such standards would have on the college and on specific departments.

Before the above charges could be addressed, the committee found it necessary to define basic competencies. For the purpose of this report, the committee considered basic competencies to be: (a) English usage to include both the written and spoken word, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) basic arithmetic computation.

This committee believes that Central Washington State College as an institution of higher learning has not only the right but also the responsibility to establish standards of achievement in the above areas. This committee believes that the basic responsibility for student competencies rests with the faculty. Student competencies, among

other things, include the demand the faculty is making on students. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to see that students demonstrate writing of basic English in his or her particular field of endeavor. The committee also believes that the best place to check student competencies is in the classroom by examination papers and assignments made to students by individual faculty members. We believe that each course is a series of checks to see whether or not the individual is competent in basic skills as well as a check of subject matter competency.

We must assume that students have been taught to do proper writing, spelling, and arithmetic computation, but the demand has not been put on these students to check on these competencies. Each department must accept the responsibility for ensuring that each student meets general competencies for that particular discipline.

The committee reviewed a report to the Dean of the School of Behavioral Sciences regarding English proficiency. Much of the following material is taken from that report. We commend Richard Alumbaugh, Roger Garrett, James Goodrich, Robert Jacobs, Thomas Kerr, Phil Tolin, Gordon Warren, and Roger Winters for the fine work they did on this committee. A copy of the report is attached.

While it is easy to blame the public school teachers, one should remember that these teachers are a product of their own college training. If they are not forced to write literate, organized compositions and write them often, they will neither expect nor require the same from their own students. We have good evidence that people teach like they are taught. The faculty of four-year colleges and universities which graduate semi-literate teachers share the responsibility for problems faced today. Professors on this campus as well as others have come to rely on exams which do not require students to display and sharpen their skills of organizing and communicating the materials they have assimilated. In many cases, term papers disappeared long ago and those professors who do require papers usually emphasize research in content over syntax, grammar and spelling. If semi-literacy is acceptable to college professors, it may be unreasonable to expect public school teachers to seek better from their own students.

We must also emphasize the legalistic aspect. Simply stated, that is, it is easier to justify a grade for an objective test than it is to justify a grade for an essay exam. Faculties should understand that if an essay exam is properly written and properly administered, it can be just as thorough as the so-called objective test and can assess many of the competencies to which this committee is making its report.

Because of funding and because of the emphasis attached to "numbers," many faculty members on this campus and others have made an interpretation that the administration as well as the state legislature is interested in quantity and not quality. The academic administration at Central Washington State College insists that they do not want to

cheapen the qualitative aspects of education. They do not want Central Washington State College to function as a factory, to become little more than a diploma mill. Even though emphasis is placed on enrollment and class size in relationship to institutional budget, quality can still be emphasized. The committee realizes that in order to require remedial work of students the administration as well as funding sources from the state legislature must realize that college graduates, in order to be proficient in basic competencies, will need remediation and that some method of funding must be provided if that remedial work is going to be offered. Also, measures must be approved which allow faculty members to devote more time and effort for students' writing, spelling, and arithmetic problems.

Students on this campus as well as other campuses have large blocks of time for passive entertainment, because evidently they are not being challenged in their classwork. If these students were required to read materials pertinent to their coursework and then were held accountable for failure to complete assignments, we would undoubtedly see a rise in literacy. Presently, we are operating under a non-punitive system of grading because society is demanding it. But, on the other hand, colleges and universities are falling into disfavor because we are not demanding that students demonstrate basic competencies in their classrooms. This is a dichotomy. Tougher standards will not be applied, either in the public schools or on the college and university campuses, until instructional staff members as well as parents demand a return to established educational principles which have fallen into disfavor with the present generation of so-called "educators."

All of the following is either directly quoted or para-phrased from the report to the Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences with the English Department Composition Curriculum Committee's response in brackets.

This committee feels that corrective steps must be taken to halt the steady erosion of English proficiency at Central and throughout the entire state educational system. Curricula must be shaped to require students to write extensively. We see nothing extreme in our proposals. Indeed, we view the following recommendations as essentially conservative, the minimal measures necessary to roll back the deepening gloom of semi-literacy:

1. Require all matriculating students to take a remedial class (English 099) which emphasizes basic grammar, spelling, punctuation, usage rules, vocabulary building, and similar skills. Students would be able to challenge the class by taking a combination objective and written exam which would test basic skills as well as expository writing ability. Passage of the exam would exempt the student from taking the course, but no credit would be given.

[In-coming students who score low on the relevant sections of the Washington Pre-College should be required to complete English 100, Basic English Skills (a new course being developed by the Comp Committee) before they are allowed to take English 101. Students who still appear in English 101 with serious deficiencies could be referred into the remedial course, perhaps via an Incomplete in 101, or some such--the logistics remain unclear. Also, we are thinking in terms of some mini-courses in the Writing Center, courses that would deal with specific problems, such as spelling, or syntax and style, or usage, or vocabulary-building. Students would be referred into appropriate mini-courses. Students in other composition courses who prove to have persistent, specific problems with their writing would also be referred into these mini-courses.]

2. Return to a three-quarter English composition sequence (101, 102, and 103, each worth 4 credits). A shorter program, like the present system, is quite inadequate. It should be a true composition sequence and not be geared to students needing remedial work. While the exact content of these courses would be determined by the English faculty, acting in consultation with a committee of the whole faculty (to be discussed below), we hope that the structure would introduce skills in rhetoric, organization of expository writing, additional grammar study and vocabulary building, elements of style, research writing skills, and development of a more polished style through frequent rewriting of assignments.

The three composition classes would have to be taken in sequence and as soon as possible after admission to Central. Each segment would have to be offered and staffed each quarter with adequate sections of sufficiently small size to provide individual attention. It would mean hiring additional staff solely for this purpose in some cases. More money would have to be appropriated, and not at the expense of other programs, because large composition classes are self-defeating.

[The 101-102-103 sequence produces all kinds of problems for the English Department and is probably of questionable value to the student. We like the idea of something going on in the junior year that can serve as a sort of 10-week literacy exam and that can also get beyond the standard freshman composition kinds of writing concerns. What the Comp Committee is evolving is this: A remedial course; then an English 101 required of all students; then an English 102 required of students who do not do well enough--say, get an "A"---in 101; then there would be a 301, or more accurately, a cluster of 301 options.]

3. Abolish English 301 as a required class if a three-quarter composition sequence is instituted. English 301 should be

transformed into an elective advanced composition class and not used as a last-minute attempt to remedy students' literary incompetence.

4. An All College Committee on English Composition--on which faculty from many departments, including English, would serve--should be established to: (1) assess the purposes and goals of present composition classes in order to determine how they might better serve the needs of the rest of the college community beyond the English Department; and (2) assess the overall impact of the recommended program upon the college in order that enrollment (which, today, is the name of the game) may not suffer as a result of it. The committee should explore the possibility of insuring equality of standards through coordination with all four-year public colleges and universities.

This committee should become a permanent overseer of the English composition program to make certain that common expectations and goals are being achieved. Entrusting this task to the English Department alone would both create a conflict of interest and make it the scapegoat if difficulties develop. All faculty have a stake in literate students and no department has a monopoly on usage of the English language or setting standards of competence.

[The All-College Committee on English Composition seems a good idea--though the term overseer is perhaps needlessly threatening in tone. To the functions listed in your report for this group we might consider adding "overseeing" the things mentioned in points 5 and 6. Also this group might begin to explore ways of getting something like an in-service program set up for talking with faculty about setting up writing assignments and responding to the students' written work. Also, they might be involved in liaison with public schools and Central's policies concerning English composition. They might even begin to look at the official "written voice" of the College--that is, writing that goes out in official publications and even letters from administrative offices, and does so much to establish a kind of public tone for the school.]

5. Since proper use of the English language is the coin of the realm in higher education, professors should be encouraged where possible to give essay exams and to require term papers or similar expository work. Both exams and papers must be graded on more than just content. Work done outside the classroom should be done over and over until it meets acceptable English standards. Students learn to write by writing, and develop writing skill at a much faster rate when the method of instruction is "carefully supervised

practice." "Modern English, especially written English," George Orwell has stated, "is full of barbarisms which spread by imitation and which can be avoided if one is willing to take the necessary trouble."

Professors who feel that certain students have not acquired basic writing skills should refer them to the Writing Resource Center for examination to determine if they need only temporary remedial work or if they should be remanded to one of the first-year English composition classes. The option of WRC referral is already available but insufficiently exercised. An immediate effort should be made to remind faculty of the WRC program and to encourage its use.

6. The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction should investigate the teaching of English in the public schools with a view to determining how it is taught, who establishes requirements (besides paying lip service to legal descriptions), and why semi-literate students are allowed to graduate.

We concur with the recommendation of the preceding report and commend it to you for consideration as a part of this committee's report.

The following motion was passed by the Teacher Education Council on April 28, 1976, and was directed to this committee for consideration: "The Teacher Education Council urges the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Basic Competencies to seriously consider recommending that the Testing Center administer the California Test of Basic Skills to all new students enrolling at CWSC, for the purpose of establishing norms."

This committee has chosen to add this motion to its report.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 5, 1976

Dr. Martin R. Kaatz
Chairman
Department of Geography
CAMPUS

Dear Marty:

I hereby resign from the post of Senator representing the Geography Department in the CWSC Faculty Senate, effective at the close of the present academic year. My principal reason for doing so is that I shall be absent from campus for the entire winter quarter of 1977 while teaching in Guadalajara, Mexico. The Department and the Senate alike will benefit from continuous representation in both the Senate and its committees for the school year.

Sincerely,



Otto F. Jakubek
Associate Professor

OFJ:ljl

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 25, 1976

RECEIVED

MAY 26 1976

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. David Lygre
Faculty Senate
CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Lygre:

Otto Jakubek submitted the attached letter of resignation to me. The Department of Geography at its May 20, 1976 meeting elected Joel Andress as its Senator to fill out the remainder of Otto's term, and selected Calvin Willberg as its Alternate to the Senate.

Sincerely,



Martin R. Kaatz
Chairman

MRK:ljl

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Director of the Dean

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

(509) 963-1331

May 3, 1976

Dr. David G. Lygre, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Dr. Lygre:

The George Town Ad Hoc Personnel Committee requests that an exception be made to the Faculty Code statement requiring the doctorate for promotion to Professor in the case of Mr. George G. Town, Associate Professor of Computer Science.

We will provide supporting information to the Senate Personnel Committee upon request.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Hasbrouck

Richard W. Hasbrouck, Committee Chairman
and Professor of Chemistry

Richard V. Alumbaugh

Richard V. Alumbaugh, Professor of
Psychology

Robert B. Bennett

Robert B. Bennett, Associate Professor of
Physics

Robert Y. Dean

Robert Y. Dean, Professor of Mathematics

Eugene J. Kosy

Eugene J. Kosy, Professor of Business
Education and Administrative Management

jac

OK 5/24

GUIDELINE DEFINING UNDERGRADUATE COURSE LEVEL

Course level, along with course credit and course enrollment, is an important element in the allocation of University resources. It is essential to have clear guidelines for determining course level. The following broad definitions are to be used in determining the correct level for a proposed undergraduate course.

LOWER-DIVISION COURSES (100-and 200-LEVEL COURSES)

Lower-division courses generally do not have extensive college-level prerequisites (aside from preceding courses in the same sequence). They may require substantial secondary school preparation.

Lower-division courses usually are not limited to students majoring in the field in which the courses are offered.

Any lower-division course, assuming qualified staff and other resources are available, could be offered through a community college.

Survey courses which are general introductions to a field of study offered for nonmajors are lower-division courses. So are "orientation" courses.

100-level courses should be suitable for college freshmen.

200-level courses are directed toward college sophomores though they are open to qualified freshmen.

UPPER-DIVISION COURSES (300-and 400-LEVEL COURSES)

Upper-division courses require substantial college-level preparation on the part of the student. Ordinarily this should be indicated in the course description by a discussion of recommended background which will describe to both students and advisers what is expected.

Recommended background can be indicated in several ways, among them: (1) specifying particular University courses (or their equivalents) which should have been completed prior to enrollment; (2) specifying a certain number of credits in specified areas which should have been completed prior to enrollment; (3) specifying a certain number of total college credits which should have been completed prior to enrollment (or an equivalent such as "senior standing"); (4) specifying permission or requiring an entry card so that some sort of direct assessment of the student's qualifications is made.

300-level courses are directed primarily at juniors and seniors. Ordinarily they are not appropriate for well-prepared graduate students nor are they appropriate as a part of a graduate program.

400-level courses should be appropriate for either seniors or graduate students.